



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

'warning', 'suggesting' (*moneo, suadeo, censeo*); 'ordering', 'directing', 'charging' (*dico* and its compounds, *impero, praecipio, mando*); 'exhortation' or 'encouragement' (*hortor* and its compounds); 'wishing' (*volo* with its compounds, *opto, studeo*). If we undertake to subdivide the independent subjunctive accordingly, it is obviously incomplete to confine ourselves to 'hortatory, jussive, optative'; the more elaborate terminology of Professor Hale is truer to fact and more helpful to the teacher. But for the learner so many distinctions are bewildering; and Professors Gildersleeve and Lodge are equally true to fact in going back to the fundamental notion and using the one term 'optative subjunctive' (which I prefer to call 'subjunctive of wish', because the Saxon word is more distinct than the Latin). Their remark, that "the subjunctive is used as an imperative", I should discard, since the name 'imperative' defines form, not signification.

Alongside, however, of the subjunctive of wish I should set as a distinct category that of willingness or concession. We have here not two tones of utterance but two differing attitudes of mind. It is true that the identity of form may raise a doubt as to the signification; in Cicero, Cat. 4.9 *vincat* may be rendered either by 'I desire it to prevail' or by 'I am willing that it should prevail'. But there are expressions enough of the type of *exeant*, Cicero, Cat. 2.6, to justify a distinction which extends also to the dependent clause; the subjunctive with *licet, concedo, permitto* is easily differentiated from the indirect wish.

II. The Classification of the Uses of the Dative

In considering the dative I start from Professor Fay's point of view³, that it is "by and large a personal case". I agree with him in rejecting both the term 'dative of separation' ("ill chosen as regards syntactical theory"), and the common doctrine that the case is often due to prepositional composition of the verb⁴, as also in giving to students as a first and most distinctive illustration of the personal dative such examples as that which he cites from Plautus, Capt. 1027 *ut istas compedes tibi adimam, huic dem*. His picturesque terms—*tibi*, "dative of loser", *huic*, "dative of receiver"—I do not adopt, but am content with the traditional 'advantage' and 'disadvantage', not only from reluctance to employ new terminology where the old seems sufficient, but also in the belief that what we call the 'dative of indirect object' denotes primarily the person whom the action tends either to benefit or injure, and that the use of the thing as indirect object is in great part, if not altogether, a development from the personal use.

The great bulk of datives fall under this first head: they are either personal or extensions of the personal use. The second place I assign to a dative over which

Professor Fay passes somewhat lightly, that of purpose or tendency. The number of nouns so used is not large; Roby's list (Latin Grammar 2. xxxvii-lvi) shows less than two hundred, and of these only a small number occur frequently. But the construction is a marked idiom, belonging especially to the best Latin prose; and it is set off distinctly from the first class by the generally verbal, or abstract, character of the nouns in which it is exhibited. Roby lays stress on its predicative function, but observes that *frugi* comes to be used as an attributive adjective; and perhaps the adjectival character of the construction is its most distinctive feature. In *auxilio millere* the noun may be paralleled by a relative (adjectival) clause of purpose; *usui* differs from *utilis* only as 'of use' differs from 'useful'; compare Varro, R. R. 1.2.18 *pecudes culturae sunt inimicae ac veneno*.

In the main these two classes include all examples the theory of which need be taught in the first three years; in Vergil the pupil meets with a third distinct use, the local dative. The fact that other Indo-European languages have this does not prove that it was transmitted to Latin from prehistoric usage; we should in that case not expect to find it prominent first in the highly artificial Augustan poetry. The examples adduced from early Latin (see Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin, 2.189-190) can be explained as due either to personification or to the influence of the personal dative. The Vergilian use I take to be only one manifestation of a general tendency to substitute the dative for a prepositional phrase—a tendency operative in the earliest literature and steadily increasing in force. It is illustrated, for example, by the occasional use in early Latin of *rei* for *in rem*, 'profitable'; by Cicero, Quint. 17 *quis huic rei testis erit*, with which compare on the one hand Cicero, Marc. 16 *huius rei M. Marcello sum testis*, which shows the normal use of the cases, and on the other the prepositional *in (ad) rem* with *testis sum*, and the like, in Cicero, Quint. 37 and 75, Plautus, Trin. 234, and the Lex Acilia *passim*; by Caesar, B. G. 2.24.2 *fugae mandare*, beside the common *in fugam dare*; and by the use in Livy and later writers of *paratus* with dative, while Cicero and Caesar have *paratus ad*. I will not try to discuss here the varied causes for this tendency, only remarking that in the one clear case of a local dative before Vergil, Caesar's use with *appropinquare*, we may perhaps recognize the influence of Greek. Caesar's Latin is indeed as pure as Cicero's; but even Cicero occasionally used *et* for *etiam*.

RUTGERS COLLEGE.

WM. HAMILTON KIRK.

REVIEWS

Janus in Roman Life and Cult. A Study in Roman Religion. By Bessie R. Burchett. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company (1918). Pp. 75.

The pages devoted to Janus in the handbooks often give a misleading impression both of the certainty of the information they impart and of the fullness and

³The Latin Dative, The Classical Quarterly 5 (1911), 185 ff.

⁴See the very full statistical treatment of this matter by Professor E. B. Leese, The Dative with Prepositional Compounds, American Journal of Philology 33 (1912), 285 ff.; also an article by him in The Classical Journal 8.7-16. See also B. M. Allen, The Dative with Compound Verbs in Latin, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.170-173.

character of the sources on which they are based. Inscriptional evidence for Janus is almost entirely lacking; no statue of him has been found, and Latin writers mention at most three. The literary references are of an unusually fragmentary character and the temptation is great to draw definite conclusions from a possibly mistaken interpretation of a single word and to make inferences and combinations that look reasonable enough but cannot maintain themselves in face of a demand for definite evidence. Ancient speculations on his nature emanate from men whose ignorance was deeper than our own.

Miss Burchett's monograph, a dissertation presented to the University of Pennsylvania, emphasizes the paucity of real information which we possess about this puzzling but important deity. Her work, containing, she says, all the references in Latin literature to Janus and his cult, affords a handy conspectus of our knowledge.

Her first chapter, entitled Theories Concerning the Origin of Religion, is explained and justified by a subtitle, The Beginnings of the Janus-Cult. She discusses the theory that deities develop from the dead, some of whom are slain for the precise purpose of deifying them; the theory that gods develop from kings, slain, too, for the good of their people; and the theory that the gods of Latium developed from vague *numina*, personalized largely under Greek influence. In the last of these ways arises Janus, the *numen* of the doorway. No cosmic functions are his, except as he receives them from Greek philosophy, supported by the false etymology, *Ianus* = *Dianus*. Once consider him cosmic and the one thing about him which seems clear, the equation *Ianus* = *ianus*, falls to the ground. This Miss Burchett properly retains. The preeminent importance of the *numen* of the doorway she explains by the strategic importance of the doorway as the place at which attacks from foes were most to be expected. This seems to me a lame explanation, considering the large part played by the housedoor—and the threshold—in folklore in general and especially in Greek and Roman religion. See M. B. Ogle, The House-door in Greek and Roman Religion and Lore, Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 40. lxxvi-lxxviii, and American Journal of Philology 32.251-271; Samter, Geburt, Hochzeit, und Tod, 141, et passim.

As Vesta, spirit of the hearth, presided over by women, became a woman, so, thinks Miss Burchett, Janus, spirit of the house door, defended by men, became a man. For the same reason he became a god of generation and had the cognomen *pater*. Here again, taking our cue from Samter and Ogle, who have emphasized the close connection between the door and the spirits of the departed, we may more simply derive both the masculinity and the paternity of Janus from this mystic connection of the door with departed spirits, which in ancient Rome were worshiped by the *pater familias* (Ovid, F. 5. 429 ff.) and are almost universally connected with the preservation of the family and the birth of children.

Chapter II deals with Prayers and Formulas, first the so-called Salian fragment, which is really too obscure to be of much use to any one but philologists. Janus was prominent in rustic ritual, *devotio*, and Arval cult. As every sacrifice closed with worship of Vesta, so it began with worship of Janus, not because he was god of beginnings—Vesta was not goddess of endings—, but because of his importance. For, as Miss Burchett goes on to maintain in Chapter III, he was not god of beginnings at all. He was never worshiped as such; he was god, not of the first month, but of the eleventh. The Kalends were not sacred to him. He was not a god of dawn. Nor was he properly a god of time's beginnings, a cosmic deity. He is as much a god of endings as of beginnings.

In some of this Miss Burchett is, I believe, right. For Janus as god of dawn the evidence is pretty slender. But as god of the first month we cannot get rid of him so easily. March was not the first month in the sense that the year really started with it. The natural year begins after the winter solstice and everything points to the fact that January-February was an ancient season of great religious import, either connected with the beginning of the year or at least preparatory to it. Certainly it looked forward rather than backward, so that January formed a portal to the year and no fundamental innovation was made when it officially became the first month.

And Miss Burchett can deny Janus a place as the god of the Kalends only because she deprives him of the *rex sacrorum*, of which more anon. She is in error, I believe, in her explanation of the lifting of the Roman bride over the threshold of her new abode. Winternitz, in 1892, arrived at a much better explanation. The matter has been fully discussed and new light has been shed upon it by Samter (Geburt, Hochzeit, und Tod, 136-144).

The gist of Chapter IV, The Statues of Janus, is that of the three statues mentioned by ancient writers two were not representations of Janus at all. Chapter V, The Connection of Janus with Early Coinage, maintains that the two-faced Janus on the old *as* was borrowed from the two-faced Hermes (the double herm) on Greek coins. As the Romans became interested in trade, Janus became its god, and assumed the two faces of Hermes, helped, perhaps, by the analogy of the door that opens both ways. But Janus's two-facedness stopped there. It was never transferred to his images.

Chapter VI is entitled Janus Geminus and other Janus-Arches and Temples. The true representation of Janus was no image, but the arch called Janus Geminus. Even this was no representation. Rather it was the god himself. The cult at this arch was one of the last traces of paganism to survive. There were other Janus arches, but none equalled the sanctity of this. Miss Burchett follows Fowler against Wissowa in denying that the Tigellum Sororium was a Janus.

One of the most important chapters in the book is Chapter VII, The Rex Sacrorum. The substance of it

first appeared in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.33-37. It maintains that the *rex sacrorum* was priest not of Janus, but of Jupiter. Already in 1892 Speyer pointed out that there is no evidence for connecting the *rex* with Janus (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 26.27 ff.), and in 1899 Fowler observed that, though the *rex* is specially concerned with the cult of Janus, he represents the whole community in his priestly capacity (*Roman Festivals*, 335). Miss Burchett's argument is that the priest-king was originally both deity and victim. In the latter capacity he incarnated Jupiter. The title of *rex* is constantly bestowed on Jupiter, who is as constantly associated with kings. The king must have been the mortal representation of the god whose attributes he bore, and the *rex sacrorum*, who was the survival of the king and continued to possess certain of his insignia, must therefore have been a priest of Jupiter.

To this the obvious objection is that Jupiter then had two priests, the *rex sacrorum* and the *flamen Dialis*. Miss Burchett admits as much, but maintains that the latter was the true cult priest; in the *rex* she sees the proxy of the king—one to whom he confided his purely religious duties, such as a civil officer would find it more or less irksome to exercise. By the time the Republic was instituted, the *rex sacrorum* had become a mere shadow; the important functions were in the hands of the pontifex. No one objected to the name, because the *rex sacrorum* had become so otiose that no danger whatever was to be apprehended from him.

To prove that the *rex* was not a priest of Janus Miss Burchett is forced not only to ignore the suggestive parallelism between household and State worship, but also to overthrow the evidence that the Agonalia of January 9, at which the *rex* was active, was a rite peculiar to Janus. In this she is, in my judgment, not very successful. With as little success does she meet the further difficulty that to deprive Janus of the *rex* leaves him without known priest or flamen. True, answers our author, he had none, but neither had Consus. Fowler has suggested (*Roman Festivals*, 270) that certain deities like Janus or Saturnus may have lacked flamens because they were descended, not from the primitive household nor from an early form of community, but from a place or a process common to several communities, such as a forum for the transaction of business. But, to me, to leave without any priest at all a god whose function in cult was as important as that of Janus, seems a more than doubtful proceeding.

Chapter VIII deals with the relation of Janus to various other deities, Jupiter, Juno, Diana, Mater Matuta, Ops Consiva, and Carna. Chapter IX consists of three brief notes and is followed by an excellent Bibliography.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT.

Survey of the Ancient World. By James Henry Breasted. Boston: Ginn and Company (1919). Pp. xi+417. \$1.40.

This book is an adaptation of the author's Ancient

Times, for such Schools as cannot give to ancient history the amount of time demanded by the larger work. A book of 716 pages is condensed to 394 pages of text, with the space fairly apportioned to oriental history (106 pages), Greek history (147 pages), and Roman history (141 pages).

Those of us who have been charmed by Professor Breasted's fascinating presentation of the subject in his *Ancient Times* will regret that the necessity of abridgement has been imposed upon him by the homoeopathic curricula of our modern Schools. The limitations of space are most evident in the last section, where Roman imperialism, law, and constitutional forms are treated very cursorily. The wealth of illustrations in the earlier book has perforce been reduced in the *Survey*, but the author has wisely retained the full descriptions, which greatly enhance the value of the illustrations for junior students. It may be noted that the hexastyle temple on page 186 is incorrectly labelled the Parthenon, which is, unhappily, by no means so well preserved.

The author's aim is to place before the student the life of ancient peoples and the development of civilization as it swings in its orbit of the early Mediterranean world from Egypt to Rome. The *Survey of the Ancient World* presents this story with scholarly accuracy and refreshing vividness, a combination of qualities of which our School histories are too seldom guilty.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

A. C. JOHNSON.

M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber VIII. Edited by J. P. Postgate. Cambridge: at the University Press (1917). Pp. cxii + 147.

Admirers of Lucan who think that he receives less than his due share of attention will welcome Professor Postgate's edition of Book 8—the only edition, apparently, in English of a single book of the *Pharsalia* since Professor Postgate edited Book 7 (1896). It is to be hoped that Professor Anderson is planning an edition of the whole poem, but meantime editions of separate books would be useful, notably of Book 4, perhaps the most interesting of all the books, with Caesar's fighting in Spain in the earlier half, and the episode of Curio's African campaign and his death in the latter half. The last twenty-five lines of the book, especially the famous line (819),

momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum,

are perhaps the finest in all Lucan. It may be noted that Professor Postgate, like most scholars, rejects the title *Pharsalia*, which has, of course, no real support; however, the poem will doubtless continue to be called by it, if for no other reason than that it is less ambiguous than *De Bello Civili*, which has to be shared with other works.

Professor Postgate is by no means a thoroughgoing admirer of Lucan; he quotes, with surprise (xc), Shelley's letter, "I have also read the four first books of Lucan's '*Pharsalia*', a poem, as it appears to me, of wonderful genius and transcending Vergil"—a dictum